Examiner-Initiated Interview Sum		Application No.	Ap	plicant(s)	
	mary	10/659,145	МС	MCMASTERS, MARIE ANN	
Examiner-initiated interview Summ		Examiner	Art	Unit	
		Ted Kim	374	46	
All Participants:		Status of Application	 on:		
(1) <u>Ted Kim</u> .		(3)			
(2) <u>Francis Conte</u> .		(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>16 November 2005</u>		Time:			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		ant's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: Moertle et al					
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed: Moertle et al				·	
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	E GENE	RAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DIS	CUSSED:	
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a set directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a set did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	ation. Th eparate	record of the substance	a written su of the inter	ummary of th	e substance
		•			
\sim					
nn (SSE Sissature)	A 1:	114 P 11 D		.,	
Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applican	t/Applicant's Representa	itive Signati	ure – if appro	priate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was determined that the Moertle et al reference had not been applied from the first office action and that the grounds for denying consideration of the affavit were withdrawn. Furthermore, a discussion of "axial spacing" and "transverse spacing" to clarify the issues that have already been developed on the record. It was determined that the use of "axial or locally transverse spacing" was consistent with the disclosure and drawings.